CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXVI No. 1 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* January 1975

SAY NO TO TERROR-CIDE

by Rosine de Bounevialle

December is evidently the open season for sell-outs. While the world feverishly enjoys—if that is the word—its annual bonanza trying to forget its selfmade disasters in preparations for winter solstice celebrations whether Christian, pagan or Jewish, power-hungry devils are ever busy camouflaging with brotherly love the same hellish pits that have successfully swallowed men and nations before. December 1974 was no exception.

THUMBSCREWS FOR SMITH

South Africa's Prime Minister, swathed in olive branches, secretly stumped round the black republics reportedly promising mediation between unrepentent terrorists (who had to be released from detention for the purpose) on the one hand and settlement-seeking Rhodesians on the other. If the conference, organised in Zambia, that followed was the result of Vorster thumbscrews on Ian Smith, nobody appeared at all perturbed about it, least of all the Rhodesian Premier. Euphoria abounded in every liberal camp, nor was it noticeably dampened when terrorist triumph was relayed round the world and the Rhodesian representatives returned to Salisbury. "No doors had been closed" was the universal comment, and Vorster underlined it saying:

> "South Africa will continue its efforts if at all possible to bring the parties together again around the conference table. The alternative is too ghastly to contemplate".

British polititions were too busy making sure that our own terrorists will still be alive to be "conferred with" at some later date to do more than contribute encouraging noises during sessions on "the box" featuring dusky equivalents of "Provos" and "Sinn Feiners" who, in the same breath proclaimed present victory and unceasing war until they have inaugurated a Zimbabwean Golden Age.

THE "DEMOCRATIC" TERROR

If truth is indivisible, so it seems is treason. For the last three decades, British governments have dispatched British armies overseas at different times to different places to deal, in what the relevant local community deemed an appropriate fashion, with murderous minorities engaged in terror campaigns against the law-abiding majority. In all these cases the manifestations of the World Revolution were and are instigated and extended by the awesome power of international finance abetted by the treason of so-called democratic leaders.

The unvarying terrorist defence is that it is the only available method of "freeing the people" from the oppressor—i.e. the lawful government; the sequels, therefore, have all been the same; at great cost, the army does its job; murderers are caught, tried and convicted, then, soon or late, they are unleashed on the very people they have terrorised who, naturally, try to save themselves by making friends with the imposed mammon of iniquity. The distant government then withdraws the army, surrenders political power to the terrorists—sending a member of the Royal family to make the surrender more abject—and afterwards has the effrontory to tell its bewildered electorate that: "being a democratic government it must inevitably bow to the will of the majority".

The idea of a world seething with repressed majorities is assiduously fostered by liberal factions everywhere. The writing is not only on the wall but in a recently published report, *Aid in Conflict*, commissioned jointly by the somewhat incongruous combination of War on Want, the International University Exchange Fund and Joseph Rowntree Social Service Trust. Its author, Mr. Lionel Cliffe of the University of Zambia, advances as one of the reasons for "lack of aid", the insufficiency of information about liberation movements and conditions in the areas they "administer". (Lack of British aid, one supposes, since there has been no shortage of international finance for promoting revolutionary violence anywhere.) The report predictably rejects the popular argument that because these movements pursue their political aims through violence they should

not be given aid, with the rebuttal that their violence is not terrorist at all because it is a *response to oppression* and that anyway they now *control* big populations of civilians.

Mr. Peter Burns, General Secretary of War on Want, evidently agrees with this proposition since he "would like to think this report will get British aid moving".

War on Want admits to sending £12,000 worth of aid to Portuguese terrorist areas since 1971. Oxfam has given medical aid in the same cause and Christian Aid has expressed interest in following War on Want's example. These are some of the major advertising "charitable" organizations recommended to church-goers from almost every pulpit in the land. The World Council of Churches *has* been busy.

A few months ago a different report was issued by the Rhodesian Information Office, which was not thought worthy of notice by the mass media. It is called *Anatomy of Terror* and contains official reports of seventy-seven terrorist "incidents" in various Rhodesian border districts from 10th May 1973 to 10th May 1974. It is illustrated by horrifying photographs of the victims. Two quotations should be enough to show how damning is the case against the Matabele "heroes" of ZANU who boast of their "guerilla" successes claiming the right to rule *Zimbabwe* because "they have done all the fighting", from which one gathers that their "political" counterparts, the Mashona ZAPU may be playing an even more traditional role as soon as the Matabele are free to take the modern equivalent of an assegai to them.

Says *Anatomy of Terror*:

> "30.9.73—In the evening of this day Mr. Gibson Mukunga, the headmaster of Ruwani School in Darwin District was approached by 20 terrorists. They tied his hands behind him, made him lie down on the ground and shot him in front of his assembled pupils."

And again:

> "13.8.73—Village head, Mr. Chakoma Mundoza from the Kandeya area, was shot dead by 15 terrorists before his assembled villagers. Other than that he was headman of the village there is no apparent motive for his murder. At the same time the entire gang raped the fifteen-year-old daughter of a local villager."

These are the realities of the "victories" exulted by ZANU spokesmen on British television. Will this be "sufficient information" to deter Christian dupes from financing control by terror, or will they still choose Barabbas?

MAJORITY RULE

If Rhodesia is too far away for the storm signals to be heeded in the British Isles, we shall ignore at our peril the red flags flying in our midst. *The Guardian* of 11th December, 1974 published *Devlin's Package for Ulster Peace*. Mr. Devlin, "one of the most outspoken critics of internment among the leaders of S.D.L.P." put forth "an obvious package of measures to be negotiated if the British will pick it up". It included the following four points:

1. An offer to the Provisional I.R.A. so that they should stop violent activities with the promise of the release of detainees.
2. An offer of perhaps two thirds remission of sentence for long term convicted prisoners.
3. The withdrawal of the British Army to reserved positions—in effect "back to barracks".
4. A formula for the policing of the present non-policed areas under which people in the communities could be brought into the arrangements.

Mr. Devlin described the measures as a possible face-saver for the Provisionals *whose resources were now low and who could not get front line soldiers*. (Ed.'s italics)

Shades of Irgun Zwei Luoumi, EOKA and Mau Mau!

If the success of those terrorist organisations is the criterion—and there is no reason to suppose it is not—then in the absence of any extraordinary move on the part of "the majority of ordinary innocent citizens" we may expect any present British government to surrender while there are still "second line" Provos to receive the white flag.

Democracy would once more be said to have triumphed. "Demos" is the people; the people—the majority.

The majority of people then are betrayed whilst from every minority-controlled medium comes the exhortation to realize the inevitability of "majority rule". Instead of being driven to terror-cide by this exhortation we should seize upon it and use it as the greatest weapon in our armoury. The strongest instinct in mankind is self preservation, so let us preserve ourselves and rescue others from the chaos that has already brought death to millions. We are the majority. We *must* rule.

We can only do this if every patriotic person and organisation act now. It is little use merely waiting for crumbs of television time to be

thrown to us at elections, writing to waste paper baskets via Members of Parliament or confining ourselves to protest marches. We have to make every politician adhere to his oath of allegiance or else be forced to admit and pay the penalty for his treason. The challenge of the people, by the people for the people must come, not once or twice in five years, but on every needful occasion. No petty traitor or foreign fugelman must be allowed to mouth the "diktat" of the Money Power unopposed.

Make Parliament—our servant—serve us truly or be sacked.

MAJORITY-**RULE!**

CUT AND THRUST

by KEVAN BLEACH

It now seems quite on the cards that after a heroic nine-year struggle against abominable pressures by the British community in Rhodesia to protect their country against the onrush of barbarism which has swept over most of the African continent, they are now to have all this betrayed. And, ironically, by the very man who has posed as their friend and ally throughout the gruelling times since 1965. *Candour* has been warning for some months now that South Africa's Prime Minister, John Vorster, has been making disturbingly restive noises over his country's attitude to Rhodesia, and his "Give us six months", speech early last November in which he informed the Republic's critics that they "will be surprised where we stand in six to twelve month's time" provided even further justification for doubt. There then followed the spectacle of South Africa's envoys flitting in and out of Lusaka and Kenneth Kaunda's representatives being fêted in Pretoria, and out of this conflabbing has come the bombshell that with Vorster and Kaunda's joint backing, majority rule is to be imposed on Rhodesia. Whether this will be sooner rather than later is not clear yet, for a temporary face-saving deal may be cooked up providing for an advance over two or three years to parity of representation between Europeans and Africans.

Ian Smith, as ever, is equivocal. One moment he is saying that he will remain firm to his promise that rule must stay in "responsible hands"—which, if it means anything, must mean European hands—and the next he is quoted as declaring his belief in "multi-racial" rule, apparently accepting racial partnership as a matter of principle. The great danger is that in dealing with the heavy pressures he is having exerted on him by Vorster. Mr. Smith will all too easily give way on the vital issue of White leadership and accept any compromise offered him, such as parity, which stops short, though be it by a single idea, of the actual abdication of power, and which in any case will lead logically to the latter in a very short time. He is, as A.K.C. observed, "an expediency merchant . . . apt to bend political principle to what may seem to be the advantage of the moment", but whatever formula is concocted at the forthcoming constitutional conference, Ian Smith should be under no delusion that Black Africa will not be satisfied with anything that does not provide for the rapid and irrevocable erosion of White rule. The self-interested Mr. Vorster, too, need not fool himself, as he appears to be doing at present. that with White Rhodesia consigned to the ash-bin, South Africa will be left alone to work out her own destiny in peace, for the struggle to impose there the conditions which have obtained in Zanzibar, the Congo, Zambia, Uganda, Ghana and dozens of other territories, will, if anything, intensify.

* * * *

The Home Secretary's Prevention of Terrorism Act became law at midnight on November 29th last. But although it quite rightly made the I.R.A. a proscribed organisation and gave the police increased powers to detain suspects and boot out of the country any Irish men or women they were satisfied were concerned in the "commission, preparation or instigation of acts of terrorism", it is difficult to see that Mr. Jenkins' "draconian measures" have done more than temporarily put the wind up the handful of I.R.A. cells operating in Britain. In fact, a more effective deterrent to their operations has been the prospect of their hurriedly planting a few bombs after their Christmas dinners inducing a severe attack of indigestion—hence the truce!

The right and effective course of action for Roy Jenkins to have taken would have been to recognise the I.R.A.'s campaign of terror for what it really is—high treason—and treat its agents accordingly, for the law already adequately covers this. The I.R.A. is at war with Britain—it

openly declared war at the beginning of the present "troubles" and is now threatening a vicious bombing blitz in England for the New Year—so there is no reason why those who are responsible for these outrages shouldn't be indicted for treason and, if convicted, executed. As we said some time ago, the crime of treason includes waging war against the Queen in her realm and can be committed both by subjects of the Queen and by those who owe her allegiance by their presence in the realm. Since this latter point clearly covers citizens of the Irish Republic resident in Britain, there would appear to be no obstacle in the Home Secretary's path to charging the I.R.A. with constituting a criminal conspiracy to commit treason and rounding up all its activists to stand trial. Or could it be that in these internationalist days, the concept of treason is regarded in Home Office circles as a chauvinistic anachronism?

Perhaps a definite answer to this question will be known on the outcome of Mr. Colin Jordan's application to West Midlands police to arrest Ray Burns, a local ringleader of Tariq Ali's International Marxist Group. Burns was reported as commenting on the day of the Birmingham bombings: "The I.R.A. have been the spearhead of the fight against the British Army and the I.M.G. gives them unconditional support in their fight. We further defend their right to carry their fight to this country." Mr. Jordan argued—to our minds, quite rightly—that this statement was treasonable since it supported and gave aid and comfort to the enemies of the Queen. *Candour* wishes him every success in his efforts, but we have already had an intimation of the kind of response those who aspire to apply the 1351 Treason Act today are likely to meet in the form of a *Daily Telegraph* report that Parliamentary and legal circles regard this statute as "vague and out-of date".

The terrorism of the I.R.A. will not be defeated in the end by simply arresting and punishing those who give public support to or actually commit acts of terrorism. It will only cease when the I.R.A. are irreconcilably convinced that they have lost their campaign to detach Northern Ireland from the rest of the United Kingdom by violence and fear. To facilitate this, Westminster must drop its appeasment, conciliation, low profile and all the rest of its soft options, and allow the army to seize the I.R.A. by the throat and finish them off once and for all.

* * * *

The "deep and penetrating" investigation of Nelson Rockefeller promised by the F.B.I. to see what skeletons are in his cupboard before he is accepted as Vice-President of the United States has apparently thrown up nothing more damaging than his family's backing of a derogatory biography about a political opponent in the contest for the Governorship of New York in 1970 and a couple of hefty golden hand-shakes to Henry Kissinger and the chairman of the New York Port Authority. Really, if that's all F.B.I. agents are capable of uncovering about such a leading One World conspirator as Rocky, it's high time they were given the shove and more inquiring sleuths put in their place!

The Rockefellers, in fact, have been tied up with the Money Power ever since the 1880s, when John D. the First secured from the Kuhn, Loeb & Co.-controlled Pennsylvania and Baltimore & Ohio railway companies a rebate on every barrel of oil he shipped over their tracks. Since that time the family, through their Chase Manhattan Bank and other bodies, have played Mother Bountiful to the Russians from 1917 onwards, as well as bank-rolling subversive bodies like Owen Lattimore's Institute of Pacific Relations. The American commentator Gary Allen has observed that David Rockefeller now runs the financial end of the Rockefeller dynasty through the Chase Manhattan, while Nelson takes care of the political. He has been, and still is as far as we are aware, a member of both the Bilderberger Group *and* the Council for Foreign Relations (a semi-secret organisation of financiers, businessmen and other Leftist members of the establishment which lays down foreign policy for the State Department), and he was also responsible for foisting on to the White House to keep an eye on Nixon the peripatetic with a paunch, Dr. K., who had been on Rockefeller's payroll for the previous twelve years.

Since Nelson has long sought the presidency itself, his present niche can be regarded as but a stepping-stone. One influential group in the United States who certainly won't object to his hankering after higher things are America's Zionists. According to W.N.S., a Jewish news service for Jewish publications only, Rockefeller has "long been firmly committed to the security and survival of Israel . . . He has frequently praised Israel and urged U.S. support for the Jewish state", and furthermore, in the *Jewish Week* of September 14th last, Bernard Postal revealed that "in the days preceding the final vote by the United Nations General Assembly, in November 1947, on the partition of Palestine . . . it

was he [Rockefeller] who obtained two votes from friends in Latin America that made partition and the state of Israel a reality". So there won't be much chance of Israel's interests going by the board with Rockefeller in the Vice-President's chair, and another feather in his cap as far as the Zionists are concerned is likely to be the fact that a book recently published by Harper & Row for sale mainly within the Jewish community, entitled *The Grandees—America's Sephardic Elite*, refers to the Rockefellers as a Jewish family of Sephardic descent.

* * * *

A lot of publicity has been given of late to William Rees-Mogg's book advocating Britain's return to the Gold Standard. It will be interesting to see how far this latest bandwagon of the Editor of *The Times* gains ground as the economic crisis deepens in the months to come, but in all the discussions and reviews of it so far very little appears to have been said about the consequences of our last adherence to gold between 1925 and 1931. It was on 25th April 1925 that Churchill, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, announced Britain's return to the Gold Standard. A few days later he was entertained as guest of honour by the "British" Bankers Association presided over by Sir Felix Schuster, who complimented him on his action in restoring the Standard and said, "There might be temporary drawbacks, but they would not count in the long run". These "temporary drawbacks" lasted about eight years and consisted of the closing of thousands of factories and businesses and shipyards, between two and three million workless, pay-cuts and short rations for millions and the Invergordon Mutiny. Referring subsequently to all this, Churchill said, "When I was moved by many arguments and forces in 1925 to return to the Gold Standard, I was assured by the highest experts that we were anchoring ourselves to reality and stability and I accepted their advice". It's widely believed now that one of his "highest expert" advisers was probably his bosom friend Bernie Baruch. Who, then, has been whispering in Rees-Mogg's ear, for he, too, has got the notion that anchoring the pound to gold will bring "reality and stability"? Perhaps we need look no further than the fact that the brokers who for so long have fixed the price of gold, and thus during the period when we were on the Gold Standard controlled our very lives, meet daily in London at the office of N. M. Rothschild and Sons.

* * * *

The immediate reaction of the International Left in September 1973 to the Chilean people's dramatic rejection of Marxist Salvador Allende and his regime was one of absolute outrage. Subsequently, the mass media in most Western countries have fallen over themselves to broadcast inaccuracies, misrepresentations and deliberate lies about the "wicked Fascist junta" and how it massacred thousands of people in its struggle for power. Just how different things really were is revealed in a *Report on the Present Situation in Chile* prepared by Archbishop Carlos Oviedo Cavada, General Secretary of the Chilean Episcopal Conference, which has just come to light in this country by means of excerpts published in Hamish Fraser's Catholic journal *Approaches*. Archbishop Cavada repeats much that we know already of Allende's regime—how there were shortages of most basic commodities, how the *daily* rate of inflation was one per cent and how only those workers who could present Communist Party cards were hired. But what he makes clear that is not generally known is that on top of these comparatively minor transgressions, Allende's mortal sin was his cold-blooded plan to overthrow by means of a coup the last remaining vestiges of democratic government and impose on Chile a vicious Marxist dictatorship. This, of course, was why Allende was busy arming an imported brigade of 13,000 aliens, who had quietly infiltrated into the country, and all the while he was paying lip service to his supposed goal of a democratic Communist state.

Thus it was that the Chilean armed forces were catapulted into political action by Allende—servicemen, as the Archbishop's *Report* emphasises, who were "in no way fascists or intriguers . . . neither military adventurers nor power seekers. . . . The step they took on September 11th [the day of Allende's overthrow] was a form of answer to a national demand, and from the military's point of view, they discharged their duty of maintaining order in Chile. . . . Without a doubt, the military takeover enjoys the approval of public opinion nationally. This is an indisputable fact. . . ." The international mass media was not going to be caught expressing such sentiments, however. Indeed, they indignantly deplored military rule by the new Government and produced reports which were far removed from reality. On September 11th, the Archbishop states, we all read that "2000 people were supposedly dead; the following day there were 4000 and a few days later Moscow Radio escalated them to 70,000 . . ." when, in fact, the actual death toll was less than 600. The *Report* also confirms, contrary to Press reports, "there was no confrontation of armies in Chile . . . the

Armed Forces rapidly took control . . . and armed conflicts were small and quickly subdued. But the international press kept talking about a massacre at the Technical University where six hundred students were allegedly murdered. Yet *nobody died there*". [Emphasis added.]

Archbishop Cavada is in no doubt about the motivation of the International Left's virulent hatred for the Chilean Government. "For international Marxism it was the end of a legal and democratic way to Socialism with which it hoped to inspire other countries." Well, most people in the West wouldn't share the Marxists' conception of "legality" and "democracy", but there can be little doubt that in Chile they thought they could stealthily assume power without resorting to open revolution by exploiting the weaknesses of the democratic system. And now, of course, the weaknesses of our own democratic system are allowing the Red "men of Marseilles" that Allende planned to use as his revolutionary storm-troopers to enter this country to forment subversion and agitation as most of the other "political refugees" have done that have streamed here in the past.

* * * *

Since the mid-1950s *Candour* has argued that the Common Market favoured the giant complex as against the small company and that those who planned the EEC intended that this should be so. An article in *The Daily Telegraph* at the same time admitted as much when it said "it was in the minds of the sponsors of the Market that there should be a merging of productive facilities until there might be, for example, only two motor manufacturers for all six countries". Over almost twenty years this peril has loomed ever larger to the extent now that the EEC Commission recently drew up plans for the oil monopolies in the Market to merge into one gigantic monopoly which will enjoy special tax concessions, and almost at the same time called for larger-scale assistance to the newly formed international merger of atomic power industries. These are but two stark examples of how the old Political and Economic Planning gospel of rationalization and monopoly is being applied in the EEC.

Pretty well the whole shooting-match of internationalist and one-world outfits backs the EEC and its drive towards economic monopoly, but a document has come into our possession helps to elucidate the particular pressure that the Bilderbergers have exerted. It is a transcript of a paper by Jacques de Fouchier (of whom we have not been able to unearth details yet) delivered at a Bilderberg conference held between 26th and 28th April 1968. It concerns "The Internationalization of Business" and in it is contained the following pertinent paragraph:

> "European industries must develop the ability to operate on a scale commensurate with all of Europe and its regions—a state that is, today, far from generalised. It must be admitted that in this the Americans were the first to have had the vision and imagination to grasp the potential and foresee the unity of a European market. In the realm of banking, for example, in which they benefitted from no special technological advance, and in which they were even somewhat handicapped because of difficulties in amassing sufficient deposits, the major New York banks are still almost the only ones to have instituted virtually complete services on a European scale."

If that's not an example of the Money Power laying down the law, we don't know what is, and it is significant that after 1968 the rationalization drive really got under way in the EEC. So much so that it was not long before a British government spokesman on the Common Market had the gall to assert that the international corporation has more to offer mankind than the nation state.

But the world policy-makers will not be content to dominate Europe in just an economic sense. They seek through the EEC ultimate authority over every aspect of our social and political life as well, and when they have finally destroyed our national sovereignty and are in complete control of the "positive socialist planning measures" which Harold Wilson enthusiastically declared the EEC is all about, they will exercise a dictatorship over ourselves and other Europeans as remorseless and tyrannical as that exercised by the Kremlin over the lives of the Soviet masses. There is only one way to avert this, and that is to GET OUT OF THE EEC NOW!

Owing to pressure of space Chapter XII of "Facing the Abyss" has been held over.

Read
SPEARHEAD
Edited by John Tyndall
Send for Specimen Copy to—
50 PAWSONS ROAD,
CROYDON, SURREY
CH0 20FQ

CHRISTMAS CRACKER

Stone house does not a prison make
Nor Anzac bars a cage.
Walsall convenient
Constituency
Elsewhere the scene is set
Indifferently.
On the continent
Cement
Becomes rock-hard
On guard!
Werewolves in Rumania
Are suddenly so real
And the moon in Transylvania
Fast loses its appeal
Right honourably a gentleman
Must fly
To tilt the wheel of fortune
A little on the sly.
Impulse at Miami
To be—or not to be?
To swim
Or take a jog-trot
Just so methodically
As a socialistic census
Might be made in charity!
A suit of clothes
Upon a beach
Noblesse oblige
Right honourably the gentleman
Makes self-imposéd siege.
A rendezvous
Honolulu
Incognito
Bypassing Steve McGarret
And Hawaii Five 0.
O blesséd South Pacific
Oblivion instead
Of just a former PMG
Standing on his head.
Down-under
It is opposite
For gymnastic refugee
To view things in a different light
In fact, invertedly
Australia
Fantasia
The phantom flies some more
Just out of curiosity
Jets on to Singapore
And Denmark
As a goal
To park
And there precipitate
Ghostly opinion poll
Apropos personal fate.
Circumnavigator
Unique investigator
Again airborne
Melbourne the destination
Illegal immigration
Custom reincarnation
Everyman!
The plan as such
Somewhat outside the law
But for the exposee
Self-exiléd MP
Erstwhile where was the ceiling
Conveniently
The floor!

B. E. BIGGS

OVERDUE SUBSCRIPTIONS

Amnesty for subs owing from before 1972

Due to staff difficulties following the deaths of Mr. Chesterton and our printer, reminders that *Candour* subscriptions were due have only been sent out irregularly and many of these have been ignored. Some of you are now several years in arrears but we shall, however, grant an amnesty for payments due before 1972. We realise that we are partly to blame for the situation which has arisen and we are sending reminders with this issue. In each case the reminder slip will show exact dates when subscriptions expired and the amounts owing, taking into consideration the rates obtainable for the various periods.

If you are in arrears please let us have payment as soon as possible. We regret that readers who fail to respond will not receive further issues of *Candour*.

Candour

Subscription Rates

	Per Annum
U.K.	Overseas
£2 . 25	£2 . 50 open

U.S. Dollar Rate $6 . 00

FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HANTS GU33 7DD

LIGHT & BITTER—a Monthly Miscellany from A.D.

So the teachers are getting a respectable rise at last. As a profession, teaching *should* be highly paid, but may we now hope that they'll get back to teaching the real three R's, instead of the currently popular Revolution, Riot, and Rebellion which, I understand, figure prominently in student teachers' curriculum. Perhaps, too, the new pay scales will convince students that there's more profit in becoming qualified than hanging about universities, stirring up trouble, until they can draw their old age pensions.

* * * *

Mangion, Bartolo, Micallef, Saliba. Five good old-fashioned English names to conjure with. And I'm not too sure about Silver, either. Thanks to Detective Chief Superintendent Albert Wickstead and his merry men, these six vice-kings have now been taken out of circulation for a bit, having been convicted for living off prostitutes i.e., those who have done the hard work. And I bet it hasn't been a question of "how many 5p's in a quid, duckie?" to decimalise the punchline of the old joke. Carry on, Chief Super! You're doing a great job. After a start like this, it may one day be possible to walk round London for an hour and hear some English spoken. It still is *our* capital city, isn't it? "Capital" meaning "principal", of course, rather than "wonderful'.

* * * *

I never feel sorry for politicians, especially Socialists. Though I admit to coming pretty close to it when Bob Mellish tried to resign. Well, you'd have thought Mr. Brezhnev could have afforded another carbon copy of his instructions, so that the Chief Whip could have known how *all* his troops were supposed to vote on the Defence cuts.

* * * *

How about Colin Cowdrey for P.M. and Freddie Titmus for Minister of Defence? At least, these two gentlemen have proved their willingness—and their ability—to stand up for England. Come to think about it, with a Cabinet full of British Lions . . . As only the French play rugby, and only the Dutch play some cricket, hammering Europe would be child's play.

* * * *

While the bakers won their case—to a certain extent—there's still no sign of more money for the farmworkers. Not surprising with Britain's largest and most important industry being pushed farther up the creek day by day. With so many farmers going bankrupt, what chance have the workers? Commonsense dictates that those who keep us fed are worth more than those who make our cars and keep us fed up. Don't forget, the miners could dig even less coal if their bellies were empty. But commonsense? What the hell's that?

* * * *

The great terrorist-hanging debate resulted in a win for the "Noes"—as most of us thought it would. Whilst it's too much to expect that MP's, given a vote not tied to the party line, would give in to the wishes of their constituents, is it also too much to expect that they consulted Private Jones in Northern Ireland and Constable Smith in Birmingham before our representatives' votes were cast? Representatives? Here we go. Back to the "whole-hearted consent of the British people" again! Well, we know to our sorrow where *that* has got Britain. Sorry, mein Herr, M'sieu. Have I offended you again? Good.

* * * *

So our old friend Archterrorist Makarios is back in the driving seat again. He's in for a thin time. Haven't all British servicemen's wives been flown home from Cyprus? Whom will his thoroughbred thugs be shooting in the back while they're out shopping now? Not the Turks, surely. Mind you, one never knows what brave deeds this twentieth century turbulent priest could instigate, now that he's back on the "Emva Cream" again.

* * * *

All the best for 1975, and nil illegitimae rosae carborundum—if you know what I mean.

A.D.

Liss Printers Ltd., Liss, Hants Published by Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants